

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 THOMAS M. O'CONNELL (NYSBN 1801950)  
Assistant United States Attorney

5 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900  
6 San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5053  
7 FAX: (408) 535-5066  
Thomas.M.OConnell@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
12

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	No. CR 06-00425 RMW
	)	
14 Plaintiff,	)	
	)	STIPULATION AND <del>PROPOSED</del>
15 v.	)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
	)	
16 CHRISTINA MARIE FLORES, and	)	
17 JOSE LITO CAMPOS,	)	
	)	SAN JOSE VENUE
18 Defendants.	)	

19

20 On October 23, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status  
21 conference. The parties jointly requested that the case be continued from October 23, 2006 to  
22 December 11, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. in order for both defense counsel to review the discovery in this  
23 case. In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from  
24 until October 23, 2006 to December 11, 2006. Defendant Flores, who was present with her  
25 attorney, J.A. Hudson, agreed to the exclusion. Defendant Campos, who was present with his  
26 attorney Assistant Federal Public Defender Cynthia Lie, also agreed to the exclusion. AUSA  
27 Gary Fry, representing the government in lieu of AUSA Thomas O'Connell also agreed. The  
28 parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need

1 for effective preparation of counsel.

2 SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN  
United States Attorney

4 DATED:

/s/  
THOMAS M. O'CONNELL  
Assistant United States Attorney

6 DATED:

/s/  
CYNTHIA C. LIE  
Assistant Federal Public Defender  
Counsel for Mr. Campos

9 DATED:

/s/  
J.A. HUDSON  
Counsel for Ms. Flores

12 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded  
13 under the Speedy Trial Act from October 23, 2006 to December 11, 2006. The Court finds,  
14 based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested  
15 continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The  
16 failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary  
17 for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a  
18 miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made  
19 under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

20 SO ORDERED.

22 DATED: 11/8/06

/s/ Ronald M. Whyte

RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge